

REMARKS

Claims 11, 14, 16, and 18-27 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

In the current Office Action mailed January 26, 2004, The Examiner stated:

“Applicant’s remarks indicated that drawing sheet 7/9 has been changed, but the record is not clear how sheet 7/9 is different from the sheet submitted June 30, 2003 that was previously approved by the Examiner.”

The Examiner noted appropriate response was required.

As discussed between Applicants’ representative Tom Krul and the Examiner on April 16, 2004, Applicants note that no changes were made to sheet 7/9 provided with the RCE filed December 3, 2003 compared to the sheet submitted June 30, 2003. Applicants resubmitted the sheet 7/9 documents, and inadvertently noted the figures were amended.

In the Advisory Action mailed November 12, 2003, no reference was drawn to the corrected drawings submitted on October 10, 2003 and the overall amendments recommended by Applicants were not entered, therefore the status of the corrections entered for sheet 7/9 was still pending. Applicants therefore resubmitted both a clean copy and an annotated sheet of sheet 7/9 in the Request for Continued Examination filed on December 3, 2003. No changes/amendments were made to sheet 7/9 from the version of sheet 7/9 filed June 30, 2003 and the submittal was intended only to provide the corrected/annotated sheets originally requested by the Examiner on January 26, 2004.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berry et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,311,302). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is initially noted Claim 27 has been amended to recite in part “wherein said housing is positionable on said mechanism between one of a stowed position having said housing located at least partially beneath a seat bottom cushion of said seat, and a deployed position having said housing located at least partially laterally projecting from said seat bottom cushion, such that said port is accessible by said user.”

Berry ‘302 discloses that video terminals 14 are located either forward of each passenger seat, mounted in a seatback 16, or mounted in a bulkhead forward of the seat (see column 3, lines 8-17). Video terminals 80 are “detachably mounted in an armrest console 84” (see column 7, lines 3-5). Respectfully, Berry does not disclose that either video terminals 14 or 80 are located in a stowed position at least partially beneath a seat bottom cushion of the seat as required by Applicants’ amended Claim 27 or that video terminals 14 or 80 are located in a deployed position at least partially laterally projecting from said seat bottom cushion. Berry therefore does not anticipate amended Claim 27. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claim 27.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER


The Examiner states that claims 11, 14, 16 and 18-26 are allowed. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indication of allowed subject matter.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 22, 2004

By: 
Thomas J. Krul
Reg. No. 46,842

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/TJK/cg